UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ISIDORO RIVERA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

ORDER 06-CV-2613 (DRH)(ARL)

THE INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF FARMINGDALE, et al.,

Defendants.	

## **HURLEY**, District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of the parties' recent correspondence and rules as follows: Because defendants have not yet filed a "responsive pleading" within the meaning of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Rule") 15(a), plaintiffs are entitled to amend their complaint to add new claims as a matter of right; no leave of court is required. *See Barbara v. NYSE, Inc.*, 99 F.3d 49, 56 (2d Cir. 1996) (motion to dismiss is not a responsive pleading); *see also Stewart v. RCA Corp.*, 790 F.2d 624, 631 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986) (plaintiff "did not lose his right to amend the complaint by asking leave; the district court was obliged to grant this unnecessary request").

Plaintiffs' request to add and delete parties triggers Rule 21. Although the case law is divided as to whether a party must obtain leave of court before adding or dropping parties prior to the filing of a responsive pleading, the Second Circuit appears to have adopted the view that leave is not required. *See Washington v. N.Y.C. Bd. of Estimate*, 709 F.2d 792, 795 (2d Cir. 1984) ("Since the [defendant had] not answer[ed] the complaint . . ., Washington was entitled . . . to amend his complaint [to add defendants] as a matter of right, and his request at that time should have been granted.").

## Accordingly, plaintiffs may file their Amended Complaint on or before January

United States District Judge

17, 2006. Upon the filing thereof, the Court will terminate the pending motions to dismiss.

## SO ORDERED.

Dated: Central Islip, N.Y. January 3, 2007		
	/s Denis R. Hurley,	